

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/935,334	SATO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen J Stein	1775	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Allowed

 (1) Stephen J Stein (Examiner).

(3) _____.

 (2) Andrew L. Tiajloff (Applicants' Representative).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 December 2004
Time:
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

4, 5 and 8

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Applicants' representative was telephoned and informed that applicants preliminary amendment placed the application in condition for allowance, but that there were some 112 2nd paragraph problems remaining with the claims. In particular, claim 4 recited the limitation "wherein the metallic element further comprises a second element", since it was unclear how a metallic element can contain another element", it was suggested that applicant amend claim 4 to recite "wherein the metallic element surface layer further comprises a second element". Further, it was pointed out the dependent claim 5 had been incorporated into claim 1 in the preliminary amendment, but had not been canceled. Finally, it was pointed out to applicants that dependent claim 8 was dependent on canceled claim 6. It was suggested that the claim be amended to be made dependent on claim 1. Applicants' representative agreed to make these changes by Examiner's Amendment and this placed the application in condition for allowance (See Attached Examiner's Amendment).